

REMARKS

Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,775,392 (RHOADS). The Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejection of these claims in view of the following comments distinguishing them over RHOADS.

RHOADS (col. 6, lines 22) teaches embedding an N-bit identification code in an original signal when the signal is produced and distributed. This signal might, for example, be a signal conveying music or other material. Later, upon encountering a second signal that is suspected of being a copy of the original signal, the second signal can be processed to determine whether it contains the N-bit identification code (column 8, lines 52-56).

Claims 1, 12 and 23

Claim 1 recites including software in a server that embeds a license stamp in a data file when the server sends the data file to a destination computer via a network, wherein the license stamp indicates that the data file was forwarded by licensed server software. Claim 1 also recites adapting processing software executed by the destination computer so that it processes the data file only when the received data file contains the embedded license stamp.

Although RHOADS teaches to embed an identification code in a signal, RHOADS does not teach to adapt processing software executed in a destination computer to process the signal only when the received signal contains an embedded license stamp. The Examiner indicates that such teaching is found at RHOADS col. 5, line 40-col. 6, line 65. However, no teaching regarding adapting software on a destination computer that processes the data file only when it contains the embedded stamp appears in that section of RHOADS or in any other section of RHOADS.

Claims 12 and 23 are patentable over RHOADS for similar reasons.

Claims 2 and 13

Claim 2 depends on claim 1 and is patentable over RHOADS for similar reasons. Claim 2 further recites that the embedded license stamp identifies the source computer of the data file. The Examiner points to RHOADS col. 17, lines 5-20 as teaching this. However, this

section of RHOADS merely indicates that more than one signal can have the same embedded code.

Claim 13 is patentable over RHOADS for similar reasons.

Claims 3, 14, and 24-26

Claim 3 depends on claim 1 and is patentable over RHOADS for similar reasons. Claim 3 further recites that the file is a print file suitable for causing a printer to print a document. The Examiner points to RHOADS col. 17, lines 5-20 as teaching embedding a code in a print file. However, neither this nor any other section of RHOADS teaches anything about print files.

Claims 14 and 24-26 are patentable over RHOADS for similar reasons.

Claims 4 and 15

Claim 4 depends on claim 3 and is patentable over RHOADS for similar reasons. Claim 4 further recites that the license stamp is embedded in a print file in such a way that the printer ignores it when printing. The Examiner points to RHOADS col. 40, line 50 through col. 41, line 10 as teaching this; however this section of RHOADS talks about embedding codes into motion pictures and says nothing about print files.

Claim 15 is patentable over RHOADS for similar reasons.

Claims 5 and 16

Claim 5 depends on claim 3 and is patentable over RHOADS for similar reasons. Claim 5 further recites that the action carried out by the destination computer comprises displaying an image of the document defined by the print file. The Examiner points to RHOADS col. 43, lines 30-65 as teaching that a computer displays a document defined by a print file; however no such teaching is found in the cited section of RHOADS. The cited section of RHOADS mainly teaches only that an ID code can be placed in a file header, which has nothing to do with displaying a document defined by a print file.

Claim 16 is patentable over RHOADS for similar reasons.

Claims 6 and 17

Claim 6 depends on claim 3 and is patentable over RHOADS for similar reasons. Claim 6 indicates that the license stamp is embedded in a print file and that the processing software in the destination computer is adapted to refrain from printing a print file unless it contains the embedded license stamp. The Examiner points to RHOADS col. 43, lines 30-65 as teaching this, but this section of RHOADS mainly talks about putting ID codes in headers of image and audio files has nothing to do with adapting software in a destination computer to print or not print a print file depending on whether it contains a license stamp,

Claim 17 is patentable over RHOADS for similar reasons.

Claims 7, 8, 18 and 19

Claim 7 depends on claim 1 and is patentable over RHOADS for similar reasons. Claim 7 indicates that the license stamp is embedded in a sound or video file and that the processing software in the destination computer is adapted to refrain from initiating the sound or displaying the video image unless it contains the embedded license stamp. The Examiner points to RHOADS col. 62, line 65 through col. 63, line 60 as teaching the subject matter of claim 7, however this section of RHOADS talks only about the need for a universal standard format for audio/visual data and the need for copyright protection in such files, and how embedded IDs can be included in the universal standard format. This section says nothing about adapting software in a destination computer to play or not play a sound or display or not display a video image depending on whether it contains a license stamp,

Claims 8, 18 and 19 are patentable over RHOADS for similar reasons.

Claims 9 and 20

Claim 9 depends on claim 1 and is patentable over RHOADS for similar reasons. Claim 9 further recites that the license stamping means processes the data file to determine a value of an attribute of the data file and includes a code in the license stamp indicating the value of the attribute. Claim 9 also recites that the processing software in the destination computer refrains from processing the file

unless it includes the attribute code. The Examiner points to RHOADS col. 52, line 65 through col. 53, line 60 as teaching this, but this section of RHOADS talks only about the need for a universal standard format for audio/visual data and the need for copyright protection in such files, and how embedded IDs can be included in the universal standard format. It teaches nothing about processing a file to determine a value of a file attribute and then including a code in its license stamp indicating the value of the attribute or adapting software in a receiving computer to refrain from processing files not containing the right attribute code value.

Claim 20 is patentable over RHOADS for similar reasons.

Claims 10 and 21

Claim 10 depends on claim 9 and is patentable over RHOADS for similar reasons. Claim 10 further recites that the attribute value is influenced by the number of bytes in the data file. The Examiner points to RHOADS col. 53, line 65 through col. 64, line 45 as teaching this, but this section of RHOADS says nothing about including an attribute value in an embedded license stamp influenced by the number of bits in the data file.

Claim 21 is patentable over RHOADS for similar reasons.

Claims 11 and 22


Claim 11 depends on claim 1 and is patentable over RHOADS for similar reasons. Claim 11 further recites that the license stamp includes a processing option code influencing the nature of the output the processing software produces when processing the data file. The Examiner points to RHOADS col. 53, line 65 through col. 64, line 45 as teaching this, but this section of RHOADS says nothing about including a processing option code influencing the nature of the output the processing software produces when processing the data file.

Claim 22 is patentable over RHOADS for similar reasons.

The remaining references cited by the Examiner but not applied against the claims have been reviewed and do not appear to teach or suggest the applicant's invention as claimed.

In view of the foregoing comments, it is believed that the application is in condition for allowance. Notice of Allowance is therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,


Daniel J. Bedell
Reg. No. 30,156

SMITH-HILL & BEDELL, P.C.
12670 NW Barnes Road, Suite 104
Portland, Oregon 97229

Tel. (503) 574-3100
Fax (503) 574-3197
Docket: SWIF 1981

Certificate of Facsimile Transmission

I hereby certify that this paper is being facsimile transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office on the date shown below.


Penelope Stockwell

April 13, 2005
Date

BEST AVAILABLE COPY